

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Non-Final Office Action dated July 31, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1, 5, and 16 have been amended and claims 19-20 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner indicating allowable subject matter by objecting to claims 3-4 as being rejected upon a base claim but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite; claims 5-8 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,577,061 issued to Sano et al. (“Sano”); and claims 1-2, 9-12, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,430 issued to Sakai et al. (“Sakai”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and reconsideration is hereby requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and reconsideration is hereby requested.

Applicants submit original filed claim 3 is in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As the claims particularly point out and distinctly defines the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. The claim is directed towards a proportional relationship between the width of the partition walls, which decrease from a periphery of the rear substrate toward a center of the rear substrate in proportion to a voltage

drop experienced by the bus electrodes. The Examiner is directed towards, for example, page 7, paragraph number 26 describing voltage drop due to line resistance of bus electrodes 25.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 3.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5-8 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sano. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and reconsideration is hereby requested.

Claim 5 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 5, recites a combination of elements including, for example, “the discharge spaces having different areas that increase from a periphery of said rear substrate toward a center of said rear substrate.” None of the cited references either singly or in combination teaches or suggests at least features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 and claims 6-12, which depend from claim 5 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13, recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein a luminescence of the plasma display panel is maintained while increasing an opening ratio of the discharge spaces as the discharge spaces approach a center of said second substrate to account for a voltage drop in ones of the bus electrodes of said first electrodes due to line resistance during operation of the plasma display panel.” None of the cited references either singly or in combination teaches or suggests at least features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 and claims 14-15, which depend from claim 13 are allowable over the cited references.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 9-12, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Sakai. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and reconsideration is hereby requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1, recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein the width of each of said partition walls decreases from a periphery of said rear substrate toward a center of said rear substrate.” None of the cited references either singly or in combination teaches or suggests at least features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16, recites a combination of elements including, for example, “at least three of the partition walls have different widths which decrease from a periphery of said substrate toward a center of said substrate.” None of the cited references either singly or in combination teaches or suggests at least features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 17-18, which depend from claim 16 are allowable over the cited references.

Newly Added Claims

Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 19, recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a first discharge space having a first width; a second discharge space adjacent the first discharge space having a second width; a third discharge space adjacent the second discharge space having a third width, wherein the first width is smaller than the

second width and the first width is smaller than the third width.” None of the cited references either singly or in combination teaches or suggests at least features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 and claim 20, which depends from claim 19 are allowable over the cited references.


Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 30, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5000
Fax: 703-712-5050